

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-8, 10-12, 14-36, and 39-64 remain pending in this application. As originally written claims 2-8, 10-12, and 14-35 did not invoke 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶6 as the claims do not recite the phrase “step for” and do recite acts. In the present amendment, claims 2-8, 10-12, and 14-35 have been amended to explicitly recite “the acts of” or “the act of” to make even more clear that none of the limitations in any of these claims invoke 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶6. Rather, where a limitation falls within 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶6, to aid in the public notice function of the claims, Applicants have explicitly recited either the phrase “means for ...” or “step for ...” for those limitations invoking 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶6.” Similarly, to aid in the public notice function of the claims, limitations which do not explicitly recite the phrase “means for” or “step for” do not invoke 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶6. Claims 9, 13, 37, and 38 have been cancelled by this amendment. Claims 59-64 are added by this amendment.

The Applicant acknowledges that claims 24-32 have been allowed by the Examiner.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-6, 14, 16-19, 21, 33-41, 43-45, 47-50, and 52-55 are rejected under 35 U.S. C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. RE38,663 issued to Kayani et al (“Kayani”). Kayani teaches a method of semi-continuous currency processing using a currency processing machine. However, several limitations of the pending claims are neither taught nor suggested by Kayani.

Independent claim 1 of the pending application has been amended to require “source identification information is entered into memory before or after evaluating all batches of documents.” “A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987); MPEP § 2131. Kayani discloses a bar code reader that reads the bar code on a separator card as the separator card is fed through the device. Col. 6, ll. 38-59. Thus, Kayani fails to teach or disclose all of the limitations of claim 1, and does not anticipate claim 1.

Independent claim 2 of the pending application requires “receiving source information for each batch on sequential basis before, or after, evaluating documents in the at least two batches.” Kayani in no way discloses such a limitation. Rather, the teaching of Kayani is that a “bar code

reader identifies the specific bar code number for each individual separator card” as the separator card is fed by a conveyor through the device. Col. 6, ll. 38-59. Kayani teaches receiving account data information from separator cards during the evaluation of the documents in the batches. *Id.* There is no teaching in Kayani that source information is entered before evaluating documents in the batches or after evaluating documents in the batches. Thus, for at least this reason, Kayani fails to teach or disclose all of the limitations of claim 2. Therefore, Kayani does not anticipate claim 2, and Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Independent claim 3 of the pending application recites “removing the header card from the batch of documents” as well as “placing the currency bills without the header card in an input receptacle of a document processing device.” Kayani in no way teaches or suggests this limitation of claim 3. Rather, Kayani teaches that a currency batch will include stacks of currency and separator cards between each stack. Col. 5, ll. 12-33. As Kayani does not teach these limitations of claim 3, it does not anticipate claim 3, and Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 4 of the pending application requires “processing substantially all documents from at least two batches before or after entering the source identification information from each batch into memory.” As previously stated, Kayani teaches receiving account data information from separator cards during the evaluation of the documents in the batches. Col. 6, ll. 38-59. Therefore, Kayani does not teach at least these limitations of claim 4, and does not anticipate claim 4.

Pending independent claim 5 requires “entering into memory of a document processing device source identification information for the at least two batches in a sequence” and “after entering the source identification information for the at least two batches into memory, begin transporting the batches in a sequence consistent with the sequence in which the source identification information was entered into memory, one document at a time, through the document processing device to obtain characteristic information from the documents in the at least two batches.” As previously stated, Kayani teaches receiving account data information from separator cards during the evaluation of the documents in the batches. Col. 6, ll. 38-59. Therefore, Kayani does not teach at least these limitations of claim 5, and does not anticipate claim 5.

Pending independent claim 16 requires “after determining batch information for each of the at least two batches, entering source identification for each batch into memory in a sequence consistent with the sequence in which the at least two batches were transported through the document processing device.” Kayani in no way teaches or suggests this limitation. Kayani instead simply discloses receiving account data information from separator cards during the evaluation of the documents in the batches. Col. 6, ll. 38-59. Thus, Kayani does not teach at least this limitation of claim 16.

Pending independent claim 33 recites, “after capturing information on the bar code card associated with the first batch and the bar code card associated with the second batch, causing the document processing device to sequentially transport the first and second batches, one document at a time, through the document processing device.” Applicant respectfully notes that Kayani in no way teaches or suggests this limitation. Kayani only discloses receiving data from the separator cards during the evaluation of all of the documents in the batches. Col. 6, ll. 38-59. Therefore, Kayani does not teach or suggest this limitation of claim 33.

Independent claim 34 of the current application recites “after storing the first and second source identification information in memory, transporting the first and second batches, one document at a time, through an evaluation region to obtain characteristic information from the documents.” As previously stated, Kayani in no way teaches or suggests this limitation.

Pending independent claim 35 requires “after determining the first and second batch information, receiving in memory first source information associated with the first batch of documents.” Kayani only discloses receiving data from the separator cards during the evaluation of all of the documents in the batches. Col. 6, ll. 38-59. Therefore, Kayani does not teach or suggest this limitation of claim 35.

Amended independent claim 36 recites “wherein the source identification information for each of the at least two batches is stored in the memory before the batch document information for each batch is stored, and the programming for matching comprises programming for sequentially stepping through the source identification information for each of the at least two batches.” Kayani in no way teaches or suggests such a limitation, therefore, Kayani does not anticipate amended claim 36.

Independent claim 43 requires “storing the source identification information for each of the at least two batches into memory before transporting the at least two batches past the

evaluation unit.” Kayani only discloses receiving data from the separator cards during the evaluation of all of the documents in the batches. Col. 6, ll. 38-59. Therefore, Kayani does not anticipate claim 43.

Independent claim 44 recites “storing the batch document information for each of the at least two batches into memory before the source identification information for each of the at least two batches.” As previously stated, Kayani in no way teaches or suggests such a limitation, but instead only obtains data from the separator cards during the evaluation of all documents of the batch. Col. 6, ll. 38-59. Thus, Kayani does not anticipate claim 44.

Independent claim 45 requires “a bar code gun coupled to the memory for entering the source identification information into memory,” and “allowing the source identification information for the at least two batches to be entered into memory before the at least two batches are transported past the evaluation unit.” There is no teaching or suggestion in Kayani of a bar code gun. Therefore, for at least this reason, Kayani does not anticipate claim 45.

Independent claim 52 recites “capturing source identification information on a header card in a batch of documents including currency bills to identify the source of the currency bills in the batch of documents,” “transporting the header card to an offsort receptacle,” and “directing a separator card to at least one output receptacle to separate documents from consecutive batches.” Kayani does not disclose the use of both a header card and a separator card. Kayani does disclose that currency stacks may include both a header card and a trailer card, but in no way suggests that a header card will be sent to an “offsort receptacle” and that a separator card will be sent to an output receptacle to separate documents from consecutive batches. Col. 7, ll. 36-50. Hence, Kayani does not anticipate claim 52.

Claims 6, 14, 17, 18, 19, 21, 39, 40, 41, 47-50, 53, 54, 55, and 57 are dependent claims that depend from at least one of the independent claims previously discussed. As none of the independent claims are anticipated by Kayani for the reasons given above, none of the dependent claims are anticipated by Kayani for at least those same reasons.

### **Claim Rejection – 35 USC §103**

Claim 57 was rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatenable over Kayani et al.

Claim 57 is a dependent claim that depends from claim 52, therefore, claim 57 contains all of the limitations of claim 52. As mentioned above, claim 52 contains limitations that are not

taught or suggested by Kayani. As claim 57 contains limitations that are neither taught nor suggested by Kayani, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

### **Claim Objections**

Claims 7-13, 15, 20, 22, 23, 42, 46, 51, 56, and 58 were objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant respectfully believes that with the entry of this amendment all of the base claims for the objected claims are allowable. Therefore, applicant believes that the objected claims are in condition for allowance.

### **Conclusion**

It is Applicants' belief that all of the claims are now in condition for allowance, and action towards that effect is respectfully requested. It is believed that a fee of \$500.00 is presently due to cover the new claims added by this amendment, the Commissioner is authorized to deduct the fees from Jenkins & Gilchrist, P.C. Deposit Account No. 10-0447, Order No. 47171-00400USPT. Should any additional fees be required (except for payment of the issue fee), the Commissioner is authorized to deduct the fees from Jenkins & Gilchrist, P.C. Deposit Account No. 10-0447, Order No. 47171-00400USPT.

If there are any matters which may be resolved or clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the number indicated.

Dated: March 14, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Mark R. Anderson

Registration No.: 54,656

JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL  
CORPORATION

225 W. Washington, Ste. 2600

Chicago, Illinois 60606-3418

(312) 425-3900

Attorneys For Applicant